"Pact for the Future": A Framework for the Prophesied One-World Government or Babylon the Great?

Sixbert SANGWA • October 20, 2024

We're going to discuss the "*Summit of the Future*" that took place on September 22-23, 2023, at the United Nations Headquarters in New York. This event, which adopted the *"Pact for the Future"* document, has sparked significant debate and discussion. The summit kicked off with a global call featuring pre-recorded speeches from various heads of state, including Joe Biden, Justin Trudeau, and Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva. To gain a comprehensive understanding of this event, we encourage readers to check out detailed information about the summit, its outcome documents and recordings that can be found on the official UN website. The summit's stated goals include addressing global challenges and promoting international cooperation. However, it has also faced criticism from those who view it with a discerning eye, especially its alignment with Biblical prophecy and potential implications for national sovereignty and individual freedoms. As we proceed, we'll examine both the stated objectives of the Pact and the various perspectives surrounding it, allowing readers to form their own informed opinions on this complex issue. For an alternative analysis of the summit and its potential implications, you may also want to consider this HelioWave video, which offers a different viewpoint on the event.

This event commenced with pre-recorded speeches from world leaders. Intriguingly, the striking similarity of these leaders' messages suggested they were working from a shared set of talking points. These points were echoed by nearly every speaker, indicating a unified approach. They all appear to be following a playbook centered on one key concept: the potential erosion of global freedoms. Could this be an example of what James Corbett (2019) describes as globally manipulative language? Such language, he argues, is designed to persuade the public to dismiss national sovereignty, surrender personal agency, and convince younger generations to forfeit their future—often using fear as the primary method of persuasion. Let's delve deeper into this possibility, beginning with the UN Secretary-General's key notes.

One of the most significant speeches was delivered by UN Secretary-General Antonio Guterres, who played a central role in articulating the summit's vision and goals. While other world leaders and dignitaries also spoke, Guterres, as the head of the UN, focused on key reforms. He called for changes to the UN Security Council, proposing an expansion of permanent members and granting the UN enforcement powers. Guterres also advocated for restructuring the global financial system, echoing themes explored in our previous article. These proposals align with the broader agenda of reshaping the economic world order, with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) serving as a primary method to achieve their objectives.

Antonio Guterres, who sometimes could sound prophetic, emphasized his typical talking points about the need for 21st-century solutions to 21st-century problems, echoing sentiments similar to those expressed by historian Yuval Noah Harari in his 2018 book *"21 Lessons for the 21st Century"*. Harari has often spoken about the need for global cooperation to address modern challenges, a theme that Guterres also frequently touches upon. Both figures stress the importance of adapting governance and international systems to meet contemporary global issues: *"As global shocks become more complex and disruptive, we need emergency platforms that swing into action automatically, convening major players according to agreed protocols. We cannot walk into the next global pandemic or shock without being better prepared. In short, we need greater global solidarity today and with future generations, better management of critical issues of global concern, and an upgraded United Nations that can meet the challenges of a new era."*

Note that whenever you hear phrases like *"new era", "global order" or "multinational cooperation"* and similar terms, they often allude to the concepts of a *"New World Order" or "One-World Government"*—which, in Christian eschatology, are associated with the Antichrist's reign. Guterres continued: *"Our institutions cannot keep up because they are designed for another era and another world. The Security Council is stuck in a time warp. The international financial architecture is outdated and ineffective, and we are simply not equipped to take on a wide range of emerging issues. 21st-century challenges require 21st-century problem-solving institutions, and the Summit of the Future is an important step in the journey to build stronger and more effective multilateralism."*

In short, the UN now seeks to expand its power exponentially. They aim to involve the UN in fundamental governance of all nations, redefining our rights and expanding further into education, business, and even key infrastructure projects. Their entire pitch essentially positions the UN as the de facto global government. As UN Secretary-General António Guterres stated, *"An upgraded United Nations that can meet the challenges of a new era... I appeal to all governments to make sure they are as ambitious as possible to restore the hope and trust we need in order to address the dramatic challenges of our time with a new global consensus"* (Guterres, 2023).

Crucially, they want enforcement powers—a really important distinction! They're adamant it's the only way to address these global issues, but that's not true. You'll often hear them allude to this with ambiguous quotes like *"the old way of operating is no longer fit for service."*

Guterres even said the UN should act as a medium between governments and key stakeholders: *"The United Nations is in a unique position to act as a platform and a convening space for key stakeholders."* They're talking about multinational corporations—the stakeholder capitalism model merging government (the public sector) with corporations (the private sector). See Klaus Schwab's (2021) *Stakeholder Capitalism* for more on this.

It's unfortunate that the term "fascism" has been cheapened, because that's exactly what this is: international corporatism. These public-private partnerships clearly incentivize corruption. When governments worldwide partner with select multinational corporations, those companies will drive initiatives through their products and services. Government contracts and subsidies will flow directly through a handful of corporations, effectively making them equal partners within the governance structure. This will destroy competition, absolutely obliterating it. It's basically forming a global monopoly on everything—including life itself, as with the Fourth Industrial Revolution. They want to monopolize the human genome and turn that into a commodity as well.

The Canadian Prime Minister, Justin Trudeau, echoed similar sentiments, emphasizing the global challenges we face: *"As we meet here in New York at the UN General Assembly for this Summit of the Future, we're at a **global inflection point**, faced with escalating instability undermining the very foundations of the **international order**"* (Trudeau, 2023). Trudeau's position aligns with the broader narrative of the summit, advocating for increased global cooperation and potentially expanded international governance structures to address these perceived instabilities.

It's not surprising that Brazilian President, Lula da Silva, would use similar talking points. In his address, he emphasized the need for global cooperation, stating: *"We've been talking about **global governance reforms** for more than 20 years, and **now's the time to act**"* (Lula da Silva, 2023). This statement advocates straightly the global government, which aligns with the first speakers for a global order or stronger international institutions and multilateral cooperation in addressing the so-called global challenges. I'd also like to remind you that a UN think tank was commissioned to develop a proposal for the *"Great Transition."* Within this framework, they divided human civilization into distinct eras, which is reasonable in itself. However, the crucial point is their belief that we're entering the *"planetary phase."* In this work, *"Great Transition,"* they argue that the only suitable form of governance for this stage is a global government.

This concept was referenced metaphorically by multiple speakers. Lula da Silva claimed that the clothes we wore in 1945 don't fit us anymore. While this statement might be true, global government is not the answer. The reality of globalism and centralization of power confronts us daily. One could argue that the only way forward is through decentralization, focusing on individual human rights and rational adoption of technology—rather than throwing the baby out with the bathwater. One simply can't trust the political class with more power over their everyday life. They're utterly incompatible with our freedom, as proven time and time again.

All of these speakers at the *"Summit for the Future, 2023"* emphasized four main points. First, they advocated for expanding the UN Security Council. Second, they stressed the importance of ensuring enforcement powers for the UN. Third, they called for expanding the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. Lastly, they focused on the global South, which some argue is motivated by a desire to access natural resources for the so-called Green Revolution. Notably, even the US president, Joe Biden, echoed these same talking points, demonstrating the repetitive nature of the messaging across different speakers. This repetition is a key element of propaganda, as it reinforces the central ideas and creates a unified narrative across multiple platforms and voices.

As we move forward, let's consider insights from other critics. Tim Hinchliffe (2024), referencing Derek Brose's quote "*Seizing Power Through Emergencies,"* wrote about how the UN was establishing emergency platforms that could *"swing into action automatically in times of crisis."* He noted that the crises referenced are so broadly defined that *"basically everything becomes a reason to circumvent national sovereignty."* This is evident in the UN's Secretary-General's prophetic declaration: *"As global shocks become more complex and disruptive, we need emergency platforms that swing into action automatically.... We cannot walk into the next global pandemic or shock without being better prepared. In short, we need greater global solidarity [...] and an upgraded United Nations that can meet the challenges of a new era"* (Guterres, 2023).

It's evident that the UN has framed its approach in a way that any crisis can kickstart their emergency response, essentially giving them carte blanche to enforce whatever they deem necessary. This includes superseding national governments and dictating how they must act. You are probably reflecting about who is behind modern crises! But this is why they want enforcement powers—there's no reason for them to have emergency powers without a method of forcing compliance.

Ultimately, the push for an emergency platform as part of the *"Pact for the Future"* is intended to reinforce the idea that humanity is facing a planetary emergency, which requires increased UN influence and authority. The document shies away from the term *"world government"* or *"global government,"* instead preferring *"multilateralism"* or *"global governance."* However, the outcome is the same: a United Nations with more authority to act and compel nation-states to comply with its edicts.

In his works, Bros (2023) delves deeply into the concept of resetting the financial system, discussing how it's a crucial component of the plan to restructure the entire global economy. Josh Walkos (2024) echoes this sentiment in his *"The United Nations Grand Illusion,"* stating:

> "One of the most striking examples of this expansion is the UN's foray into global economic management. The creation of bodies like the UN Development Program and the UN Conference on Trade and Development signaled a shift towards a more interventionist approach in global economics. This expansion represents a dangerous trend toward international socialism and the erosion of national sovereignty. But who truly benefits from this so-called global economic management? Is it the impoverished communities that the UN claims to uplift, or the elite circles tightening their grip on international affairs?" (Walkos,2024).

Who does it benefit? Well, I can say with certainty it's not us. As Walkos explains: *"The UN's expansion into global economics is not just a shift—it's a bold overreach into the sovereignty of nations, cloaked under the guise of collective progress."*

The UN's involvement in global economic management can be traced back to its origins, as a project of secret societies often viewed as a precursor to a potential one-world government. However, a significant shift became evident in the 1990s. Kofi Annan, UN Secretary-General from 1997 to 2006, highlighted this change in a 1998 speech, stating that *"the business of the United Nations involved the businesses of the world."* This marked a clear pivot in the organization's focus. A similar transformation occurred within the World Health Organization (WHO). Initially, in 1948, the WHO could only accept donations from member states. However, policy changes in the 1990s and 2005 allowed for private funding. Today, only 20% of its funding comes from member states, with the remaining 80% from private sources, including pharmaceutical companies and philanthropists like Bill Gates.

This corporatist shift is now reflected in their desire to reshape the global economic structure, particularly through the climate narrative. This forms the basis for their proposed new economic system, which is carbon-based. Josh Walkos (2024) offers a critical perspective on this trend: *"The push for climate finance reform is less about environmental protection and more about creating new avenues for corporate profit and government control. The proposed changes to the financial architecture under the guise of addressing climate change raise several red flags: a profit-driven agenda. Many of the largest proponents of climate finance are multinational corporations that stand to benefit enormously from government-subsidized green initiatives. This conflict of interest casts doubt on the true motivations behind their reforms."*

Walkos continues highlighting *"government overreach"*: As he explains, under the nebulous goal of fighting climate change, governments will likely intervene in markets, curb personal freedoms, increase regulations, impose higher taxes, and restrict individual choices (Walkos, 2024). This isn't speculation—it's explicitly included in this deeply flawed deal. They're not shy about discussing it. Their plans aim to control what we eat, which cars we drive, and even what information we consume. And that's just the beginning. In essence, they're seeking to micromanage every aspect of our lives. The consequences? Misallocation of resources and a stark lack of accountability. Put simply, these proposed climate finance reforms could make the pandemic's unprecedented wealth transfer—from the middle class to the top 1%—look trivial in comparison.

Looking beyond the superficial rhetoric of progress, the underlying theme appears to be greed and the consolidation of power through restricted competition, along with granting an outsized role to a select few multinational corporations. In essence, the *"Summit of the Future"* centered on several key issues: global crises, elements of their agenda, the Pact for the Future, the Declaration for Future Generations, and the Global Digital Compact.

Keep in mind that they employ circular tactics, bombarding you from all angles. Each of their proposals contains nested proposals, such as the 30x30 agenda and the 50 in 5 platform. We've encountered this before. Kit Nightly (2024) aptly summarizes it: *"In terms of real content, there are no new ideas here. We have seen this globalist shopping list of alleged "issues" before. Climate change, conflict, food insecurity, poverty, misinformation, hate speech. The usual "problems" that collectively form what the document refers to as "complex global shocks"."*

These 'shocks,' the document tells us, can be addressed with a series of solutions that are (unsurprisingly) expanded cooperation, increasing the power of the United Nations, and the post-COVID buzzword of choice—'interoperability'—all of which can be broadly defined as our old friend *'global government.'* The most blatantly authoritarian language, reserved for control of the internet, points to a global surveillance state and mass censorship.

The proposed new system revolves around a global control grid, with digital ID as its cornerstone. This digital ID serves as the linchpin, connecting various elements: Central Bank Digital Currencies (CBDCs), carbon taxes, individual surveillance, facial recognition, social credit scores, and mass censorship plans. Through this digital grid, the government can monitor all our online activities and real-life actions. The key to avoiding this digital prison is to resist adopting the digital ID—that's the essence of this global compact. It's laying the groundwork for an extensive surveillance state. The World Economic Forum's greatest concern is that some individuals will refuse to comply with this system:

> *Their biggest fear is your fight for freedom, their biggest fear is that you will make individual decisions for yourself, and you will not follow their orders. So, this digital stuff is absolutely key because without it they can't enforce anything; without it they can't mandate that you do something; without it they can't control your life. So, I don't care if you're talking about carbon emissions and what's safe and effective as far as they are concerned. I don't care if they're talking about an experimental injection a series of injections whatever they may be and what's safe and effective as far as they're concerned. This is not about those individual things, this is about the desire to control you from the outside in and if they have a digital process whereby, they can restrict your movement, your behavior and your decisions with the click of a button, you are done" (Unknown, featured in* HelioWave video).

A significant portion of the *"Summit of the Future"* focused on developing the infrastructure for this new global technocratic system, essentially contemplating how to connect the entire world's population to the internet and digital IDs. The other major focus was their plans for censorship, which is really just them justifying their actions to themselves. It's a coping mechanism, to be honest, as any rational person knows there's no justification for it—it's pure authoritarianism. But they're either in denial or trying to keep up appearances, predictably justifying their censorship plans with the usual rhetoric about combating *"hate speech"* and *"disinformation." Their* trick 's entirely subjective.

It's also deeply ironic, given that governments and legacy media are the biggest purveyors of false information day in and day out. Just remember, it's not about truth at all—it's about control. Just look at what Hillary Clinton said last week: *"We should be, in my view, repealing something called Section 230, which gave, you know, platforms on the internet immunity because they were thought to be just passive conduits that shouldn't be judged for the content that is posted. But we now know that was an overly simplistic view. If the platforms—whether it's Facebook, Twitter/X, Instagram, or TikTok, whatever they are—if they don't moderate and monitor the content, we lose total control. And it's not just the social and psychological effects, it's real harm..." (*Clinton, 2024).

There are a couple of really interesting points here. The word choice is important—by saying they will *"lose total control,"* it implies they already had total control. It also reveals their true intention; they don't want partial control; they want total control. Tyrannical aspirations indeed! It's always about political power—censorship or they lose total control. I've got to say, it's beautifully ironic that the very systems enabling this power are simultaneously connecting all of us, thus undermining them every step of the way. Sometimes there's a beautiful symmetry to the chaos. Their only real concern is that people are picking apart their lies on a daily basis, which threatens their agenda.

Let's get a better view of everything by examining Tim Hinchliff's article "A Global Control Grid":

"The second action day served as a sort of pep rally for the unelected globalists' vision of our digital future. To achieve this by 2030, the speakers highlighted a few key steps:

1. Access to electricity: People can't access the internet or use devices without it.
2. Internet connectivity for all: You can't build a digital control grid without everyone connected to the internet.
3. Digital public infrastructure (DPI): Once everyone has electricity and internet access, the digital control grid can be built through DPI—essentially digital IDs, fast payment systems like programmable CBDCs, and massive data sharing.
4. Crackdown on dissent: Label anything that goes against UN narratives as disinformation and hate speech."*(Hinchliff,2024)

That last point might be at the bottom of their list, but I reckon it's foremost in their minds. Antonio Guterres states: *"Digital platforms are being misused to subvert science and spread disinformation and hate to billions of people. This clear and present global threat demands clear and coordinated global action."* Essentially, he's claiming that your right to free speech is a *"clear and present threat to global action."* Perhaps they could try not lying for political power—just a thought.

Regarding electricity, of course, I want everyone to have access to electricity and the internet, but my motives are purely for the benefit of the people. These globalist types seem to have another idea in mind: control. According to the UN, some 2.6 billion people don't have access to the internet and are therefore not connected to the digital control grid (Hinchliff,2024). I'll reiterate: it's not that these people shouldn't have access to these societal amenities. The real issue lies in the intent behind providing access—it's not just to improve lives, but primarily for control and surveillance.

One example is their talking point about reducing smartphone prices to around $20. Is it all about affordability? Not really. As Tim Hinchliff (2024) puts it: *"This is our chance to connect everyone in the world with the tools they need to thrive in the modern digital economy."* It's really about Central Bank Digital Currencies (CBDCs), which rely entirely on surveillance and programmability. This gives them the ability to shut off an individual's access to finances if they're deemed a *"bad citizen."*

They claim digital ID unlocks previously inaccessible services, but according to the World Economic Forum, digital identity not only determines what products, services, and information we can access, but also what's closed off to us—a crucial point.

Achim Steiner, part of the UN's development program, likened digital public infrastructure to the roads and railways of our new digital era. He stated: *"We've reached a point where digital transformation isn't just about technology—it's about our lives and our children's lives. Consider digital public infrastructure. Imagine it's 2030, and every person now has a secure digital identity. This has unlocked services that were previously out of reach [...] this is a moment to redefine our digital Destiny you must turn skepticism into an appetite for the unknown, a catalyst for Change and willingness to push New Frontiers."*(Steiner, 2023) Tim Hinchliff's take on this is revealing: *"With services, credentials, and documents all centralized and connected to an interoperable system, digital identity becomes a tool for complete control over individuals. It can incentivize, coerce, or manipulate human behavior. This is our so-called 'digital destiny'"* (Hinchliff,2024).

I'm convinced our destiny involves dismantling their vision of "Destiny." The most challenging aspect of this is the need to scrutinize everything they say, as they often disguise their most authoritarian goals in utopian rhetoric. Without delving into the details, people might believe their objectives are purely benevolent, such as providing electricity and internet access worldwide. However, there's always more to it, as Josh Walkos aptly describes in his article—it's essentially a global surveillance system:

> "As part of the UN's recently adopted Pact for the Future, the Global Digital Compact has been touted as a groundbreaking framework for digital cooperation and AI governance. However, a closer examination reveals a concerning agenda with potentially far-reaching implications for individual privacy, freedom, and national sovereignty. This compact has several key objectives: 1) Connecting all people, schools, and hospitals to the internet; 2) Making data more open and accessible; 3) Anchoring digital cooperation in human rights and international law; 4) Making the online space safe for all, especially children; 5) Governing artificial intelligence; and 6) Establishing global data governance standards." (Walkos, 2024)

While these goals might appear benevolent on the surface, they raise significant concerns about the potential for increased surveillance, control, and erosion of individual freedoms. In reality, it's a gateway to universal surveillance. As Edward Snowden has stated in 2021, *"A world of universal digital identification is a world without privacy,"* and he's absolutely right (Snowden, 2021). Such a system could enable unprecedented levels of government surveillance and control over citizens' daily lives. It's even more alarming because they're moving towards what Yuval Harari describes as a *"biosurveillance state."* They're no longer just interested in monitoring our day-to-day activities; now, they aim to track what happens under our skin.

> "Covid is critical because this is what convinces people to accept to legitimize total biometric surveillance. We need not just to monitor people, we need to monitor what's happening under their skin. The next phase is the surveillance going under the skin. We now see mass surveillance systems established even in democratic countries which previously rejected them. Governments want to know what is happening under our skin, what's our body temperature, what's our blood pressure, what is our medical condition. Now humans are developing even bigger powers than ever before. We are really acquiring divine powers of creation and destruction. We are really upgrading humans into gods. Humans are now hackable animals. You know the whole idea that humans have this soul or spirit, and they have free will and nobody knows what's happening inside me, so whatever I choose whether in the election or whether in the supermarket, this is my free will. That's over now!" (Yuval Harari)

This aligns with the provocative statement by Klaus Schwab (2020), founder of the World Economic Forum, regarding their so-called Great Reset: *"In a matter of seconds, the chip is inserted, transformation is complete."* As reported by Scientific American(2019), *"When scanned, all of a person's information about their vaccination status is shown on a reader or phone."* This technology raises serious privacy concerns. The WEF's controversial prediction, "*By 2030, you'll own nothing and be happy*," (2016) further highlights the potential for a dramatic shift in personal autonomy and property rights. These developments demand careful scrutiny of their implications for individual freedom and privacy.

In fact, the compact's emphasis on making the online space *"safe for all"* is a classic example of sacrificing liberty for the illusion of security. History has shown that such initiatives often lead to increased censorship and surveillance. In the digital realm, the concept of safety can be particularly problematic because it can be used to justify numerous authoritarian measures such as mass surveillance, content censorship, mandatory identification, and encryption backdoors—and it doesn't stop there. The danger lies in the subjective nature of *"safety"* and the potential for mission creep. What starts as a measure to protect children or prevent terrorism can easily expand to suppress political dissent or marginalize certain groups. The emphasis on safety often overlooks the importance of risk and freedom in a healthy society.

However, I believe their motives are explicitly malicious and predictable. They don't seem to have a benevolent bone in their collective bodies. They crave this power for one reason: ***to control the narrative***. Their entire agenda hinges on censorship because no rational person would willingly embrace this dystopian vision. If an entire agenda crumbles when citizens speak freely, doesn't that suggest we're dealing with the villains of this story? What do you think?

In fact, another separate event focused on their censorship plans, including collaborations with Big Tech to circumvent the First Amendment. They called it "The Future of Information Integrity," which also took place at the United Nations General Assembly in September 2023 (UN Chronicle, 2023). One of the main speakers was Melissa Fleming, who you might recall claimed, "We own the science" when discussing the control of the climate change narrative. She stated: "You know, we partnered with Google, for example. If you Google 'climate change,' you will, at the top of your search, get all kinds of UN resources [...] You know, we own the science, and we think that the world should know it, and the platforms themselves also do" (Melissa Fleming, 2023).

You see, they are consumed by delusions of grandeur, and it's the same for all of them. As we already know who's behind the UN, who leads it and funds it, we know exactly who's really calling the shots. It's all about global elites and their secretive manipulations. If you don't agree with them outright, they'll target you. People are being put in jail right now in other nations for social media posts. Some arrests in the UK are purely for thought crimes, as reported by BBC News (2018). The United States government has proposed new laws against what they deem to be *"disinformation"* and *"hate speech"*—criminal penalties for speech and opinions (Klar, 2022; H.R.8728, 2022). If you can't see where this is going, I don't know what to tell you, but the whole thing is very strange. As noted by civil liberties groups like the ACLU, these trends pose significant threats to freedom of expression (Wizner, 2017).

The mind virus is a very real concept—a sort of social contagion—and they have been entirely captured by it, swallowed whole. They have absolutely zero self-awareness, no self-reflection, no introspective abilities at all, and I'm starting to wonder if the possibility of them being wrong ever even crosses their minds. I'm not too sure it does, which makes them not only delusional but also dangerous. Well, maybe they're only motivated by power and are really good sociopathic liars. That could be the case.

With that said, let's examine some concerning statements from John Kerry during the United Nations Climate Action Summit in September 2023. Kerry, in his role as U.S. Special Presidential Envoy for Climate, made remarks that raise serious questions about the challenges of building consensus and the perceived threat of disinformation:

> *"It's part of our problem, particularly in democracies, in terms of building consensus around any issue. It's really hard to govern today. You can't, you know, there's no—the referees we used to have to determine what's a fact and what isn't a fact have kind of been eviscerated to a certain degree. And people go—and people self-select where they go for their news or for their information, and then you just get into a vicious cycle."*

Kerry's comments suggest a frustration with the difficulty of achieving consensus in democratic societies, particularly when it comes to complex issues like climate change. He then goes on to make a more alarming statement about free speech:

> *"But look, if people go to only one source, and the source they go to is sick and has an agenda and they're putting out disinformation, our First Amendment stands as a major block to the ability to be able to just hammer it out of existence. So, what we need is to win the ground, win the right to govern by hopefully having, you know, winning enough votes that you're free to be able to implement change."* (Kerry, 2023)

This statement is particularly alarming as it suggests that a high-ranking government official views the First Amendment—a cornerstone of American democracy—as an obstacle to combating what he perceives as *disinformation*. It implies a desire to circumvent or weaken constitutional protections for free speech to more easily implement certain policies. This aligns with the broader concerns about censorship and control of information discussed earlier in this article, highlighting the potential threats to individual freedoms in the name of addressing global challenges. Their intentions couldn't be clearer—to them, we're just an obstacle, one that has to be *"hammered out of existence."*

As we conclude, it's crucial to recognize the common thread running through various global initiatives and proposals. Whether it's the "Great Reset," "New Era," "Global Cooperation," "Multinational Cooperation," or "Internationalization," these buzzwords all point towards a singular vision - a New World Order. This concept, while presented under different guises, consistently promotes the idea of a One-World Government. From a Biblical perspective, this aligns with what Scripture describes as the reign of the Antichrist, as mentioned in Revelation 13:1-10, 2 Thessalonians 2:3-4, and notably in Daniel 7:23-25, which speaks of a kingdom that *"will devour the whole earth, trample it down, and crush it."*

In this envisioned future, national boundaries blur, and individuals are no longer primarily citizens of their countries but *"global citizens."* This shift in language and perspective is not accidental. It's a deliberate move towards a centralized global governance structure, where decision-making power is concentrated in the hands of a few international bodies. The Bible warns of such a system, describing it as a beast that will be given power to fight against the saints (Revelation 13:7).

While we may not be able to prevent the fulfillment of prophecy, as Christians, we should be prepared as the wise virgins in Jesus' parable (Matthew 25:1-13). It's clear that organizations like the UN have already strategized for this, planning for future crises (which they may be engineering) to trigger the launch of their prepared systems. However, we should remember Christ's promise in Revelation 3:10, assuring protection for His faithful followers. As these events unfold, believers should remain vigilant and ready for the Rapture (1 Thessalonians 4:16-17), trusting in God's ultimate plan.

The articles by Tim Hinchliffe, Josh Walkos, Kit Knightly, and Derrick Broze offer valuable insights into these developments. They delve deeper into the implications of this global shift, exploring how it might affect individual freedoms, national sovereignty, and the very fabric of our societal structures. I encourage you to explore their work for a more comprehensive understanding of this complex and far-reaching topic, while also studying Scripture to discern these times through a Biblical lens.

Related Articles

- Who Really Controls the Weather and Climate?
- Could 2025 Usher in Spiritual Turmoil Heralding the Antichrist's Rise?
- Could Marburg Virus Be a Potential Bioweapon and Part of a Larger Agenda?
- Evidence of Elite Manipulation Through Geoengineering and Energy Weapons?
- How Can We Interpret the Hamas Attack on Israel in the Eschatological Landscape?
- Is There Proof of Elite-Constructed Underground Bunkers for Planned Catastrophic Events?
- How Can We Understand the Paradox of Birth Control Promotion and Humanoid Robotics Advancement?

Further Resources

- Explore Online Ministry Opportunities at Open Christian Ministries (USA)
- Explore Christian Business Services at the Center for Faith and Work (Rwanda)
- Pursue an Affordable Online Christian Degree at Open Christian University (USA)
- Kindly Share Your Question for Consideration in Future Articles. Click Here to Submit
- Ask a Question or Utilize Our Trained AI Bot to Craft Your Evangelical Article - Begin Here

← Back to blog

Comments (0)

Post Comment

AMEX VISA